UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/036,591	11/07/2001	Ran J. Flam	sparta01.005	4352

25247	7590	04/17/2006	

GORDON E NELSON
PATENT ATTORNEY, PC
57 CENTRAL ST
PO BOX 782
ROWLEY, MA 01969

EXAMINER
STEVENS, ROBERT

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2176	

DATE MAILED: 04/17/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>06 February 2006</u>.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL.**   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-19</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-19</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

        1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

        2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

        3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is responsive to communications: amendment filed 2/6/2006.

2.   This action is **FINAL**.

3.   The Office maintains the previous rejections of the claims under 35 U.S.C.

103(a), in light of the arguments presented in the amendment filed 2/6/2006.

4.   Claims 1-19 are pending. Claim 1 is independent.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6.   **Claims 1-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)** as being unpatentable over

Hirsch et al (US Patent No. 5,586,039, filed Feb. 27, 1995 and issued Dec. 17, 1996,

hereafter referred to as "Hirsch") in view of Crater et al (US Patent No. US 6,201,996,

filed May 29, 1998 and issued Mar. 13, 2001, hereafter referred to as "Crater").

Independent claim 1 states:

A graphical user interface for specifying an action to be performed which modifies a value of a field of a record stored in a memory device, the action, once specified, being thereafter automatically performed when a query with which the action is associated returns the record, and the graphical user interface comprising:
   a window containing a table wherein the field has an entry that is selectable by the user, the entry including
      a first field that identifies the field to be acted on; and
      one or more action fields that, when the user has selected the entry, the user may set to specify the action.

Hirsch discloses several graphical user interfaces (GUIs) for specifying actions to be performed in the context of a computer-based industrial controller environment in Figures 3-5 and 10. For example, Figures 4 and 5 indicate that that an action field having a value of "Implant" can be used to set or modify a Material action field. The selection of "implant" using Fig. 4, affects the specific material value, as shown in Fig. 5. Note, that the value of "Yttrium", for example, cannot be used as a material value (contrast fig. 4 before the selection of the "Implant" action and Fig. 5 after such selection). Additionally, the Technologies action field has also been limited (also contrast Fig. 4 before the selection of the "Implant" action and Fig. 5 after such selection). Figure 10 further discloses the automatic performance of actions, once established, noting the start event, stop event, and frequency parameters shown in the table of Fig. 10. Hirsch further shows the use of a processor and memory in Fig. 1B #11 and #12. Hirsch shows in Figure 2, the Fig. 2 window having a "Process Type" selection entry, which when selected shows the inclusion of an "Action" field in Fig. 4, having an "implant" Action field value that indicates that a Material action field is to be

modified (contrast Figures 4 and 5, noting that "Yttrium" is not an allowed action value in the Material field), and that a Technology action field may be specified. (Contrast Figures 4 and 5)

Although Hirsch discloses editing records (and therefore must find the record to be edited), Hirsch does not explicitly disclose querying for records. Crater, though, discloses querying for specific records associated with actions performed in an industrial control process in Figures 4A and B, illustrating the associated actions when a query is executed for the "capper" process record.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Crater for the benefit of Hirsch, because to do so would have allowed a process control interface designer to facilitate selection and performance of actions in a database and remotely display instructions, as taught by Crater in the Abstract. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., GUI-based industrial process control.

Regarding dependent claim 2-3, Hirsch discloses a plurality of types in the "Action" field of Fig. 4, these fields determining the Material field values in Fig. 4, showing the "Implant" field values determining the Material field values (noting, for instance that the selection of "Implant" precludes the selection of "Ytterbium" in Figures 4 and 5). Hirsch further teaches the use of time fields in Figures 10 and 11, noting

stat/stop/frequency values and their inputting means. However, Hirsch does not explicitly disclose the use of name data in a field. Crater, though, discloses the use of names in Fig. 4 #410, discussing a "Capper".

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Crater for the benefit of Hirsch, because to do so would have allowed a process control interface designer to facilitate selection and performance of actions in a database and remotely display instructions, as taught by Crater in the Abstract. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., GUI-based industrial process control.

Regarding dependent claim 4, Hirsch discloses clearing, cancellation and deletion operations for data in Fig. 11 and Fig. 3, showing editing buttons for clearing, cancellation and deletion operations.

Regarding dependent claim 5, Hirsch discloses setting field values in Figures 4 and 5, showing the setting of data fields labeled as "Action", "Material" and "Technologies".

Regarding dependent claim 6-10, Hirsch discloses a plurality of types in the "Action" field of Fig. 4, these fields determining the Material field values in Fig. 4, showing the "Implant" field values determining the Material field values (noting, for instance that the selection of "Implant" precludes the selection of "Ytterbium" in Figures 4 and 5). Hirsch further teaches the use of time fields in Figures 10 and 11, noting stat/stop/frequency values and their inputting means. However, Hirsch does not explicitly disclose the use of name data in a field. Crater, though, discloses the use of names in Fig. 4 #410, discussing a "Capper".

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Crater for the benefit of Hirsch, because to do so would have allowed a process control interface designer to facilitate selection and performance of actions in a database and remotely display instructions, as taught by Crater in the Abstract. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., GUI-based industrial process control.

Regarding dependent claims 11-14, Hirsch discloses applying field values in Figure 9, noting the "Apply" button. Hirsch further discloses the use of time values and their specification in a number of ways in Figure 10, noting the use of start, stop and frequency time data. Further, it is well known that time units may be expressed in alternative values (i.e., seconds may be expressed as minutes, hours, calendar days, etc.).

Regarding dependent claim 15-19, Hirsch does not explicitly disclose the use of current time, name and role data. Crater, though, discloses the use of current time in Fig. 5C, noting that the value of X=0 along the x-axis, which is labeled "Seconds Ago", reflects the time "0 seconds ago", or the current time. Crater further discloses the use of names/roles in Fig. 4A, which show the use of names/roles such as "Capper" and Conveyor" in element #405, it being merely an obvious variant to store a name or a title/role in a particular field. Additionally, element #415 of Fig. 4 lists actions associated with those roles/names.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Crater for the benefit of Hirsch, because to do so would have allowed a process control interface designer to facilitate selection and performance of actions in a database and remotely display instructions, as taught by Crater in the Abstract. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., GUI-based industrial process control.

Response to Arguments

7.   Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues on page 7 that the cited references do not disclose an action associated with a query that modifies a record field value when the query returns a record.

The Office respectfully disagrees. It is noted that Applicant's claims are directed to a graphical user interface (GUI). A recitation of an intended use of that GUI is set forth in the preamble. For example, the body of the claim sets forth no structure or process for "performing a query".

Additionally, Applicant's argument that a field record value must be modified is not supported by the claim language. The language states that a first field identifies a modifiable field. Both references teach modifiable fields in records. Further, it is generally implied that record fields are modifiable.

Additionally, since the body of the claim sets forth no structure or process for performing a query, the recited claim does not require an automatic performance of some action upon a query returning a record.

Applicant argues on pages 7-8 that the claims depending upon claim 1 should be patentable, because the cited references do not identify record field types or actions performed on record fields.

The Office respectfully disagrees. The cited art of record discloses several graphical user interfaces for creating records, modifying fields, and querying records. In particular, the primary reference, Hirsch, teaches that record field values may be affected by the action that is selected to take place. For instance, Fig. 4 of Hirsch

shows a GUI for selecting an action (that is stored as a record field). Selection of the "implant" action identifies that a material field will be acted upon, as shown in Fig. 5. The type of action further influences the type of material (i.e., the value of the action limits the value of the material field, which cannot by "Yttrium" for an "Implant" action, for instance).

For these reasons, the Office asserts the rejections under 35 USC 103(a) as set forth above.

8.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

9.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robert Stevens whose telephone number is (571) 272-4102. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 6:00 - 2:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather R. Herndon can be reached on (571) 272-4136. The current fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306. Additionally, the main number for Technology Center 2100 is (571) 272-2100.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Robert Stevens
Art Unit 2176
Date: April 12, 2006

rs

WILLIAM BASHORE
PRIMARY EXAMINER
4/13/2006